

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of:	:
Frédéric Bauchot	:
	: Before the Examiner:
Serial No: 10/803,660	: Wilson W. Tsui
	:
Filed: 03/18/2004	: Group Art Unit: 2178
	:
Title: A METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	: Confirmation No.: 6005
MANIPULATING LABELLED DATA	:
FOR DATA ENTRY IN	:
MANAGEMENT APPLICATIONS	:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.41

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Reply to the Examiner's Answer Brief of July 18, 2007. This brief is submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.41.

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENTS

The Examiner at the bottom of page 9 to the middle of page 10 of the Answer Brief stated that:

With regards to Claims 1 and 12, the appellants argue that, Salas et al does not teach the step [sic] of entering labels corresponding to the at least one input field and a label corresponding to the output field, said later label being expressed as the mathematical expression of said labels of said at least one input field as claimed. The appellant further argues that rather, Salas advocates splitting a screen in two portions, a table portion and a calculation portion. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the arguments, since the claim language does not require the screen where the input and output fields reside; to reside in the same portion. Additionally, the claim language does not require that output label(s) need to be displayed in the same portion of a screen. (Emphasis not added.)

This argument is disingenuous since the Examiner did not include the next paragraph of the Appellants' arguments where Appellants contrasted the claimed invention to the disclosure of Salas et al.

To be clear, the claimed invention includes the limitations of using labels to label input and output fields wherein the label of the output field is expressed as a mathematical expression of the label of the input field.

Salas et al. do not teach the step of labeling an output field using a mathematical expression that includes the label of an input field.

Salas et al. disclose a structurally flexible spreadsheet. The spreadsheet uses user-definable and user-changeable labels in order for the labels to be descriptive of data stored in the spreadsheet. The spreadsheet also employs a non-fixed format which is user-changeable to provide desired arrangements of stored data. Salas et al. further provide a calculation portion in the spreadsheet. The calculation portion provides a plurality of user established mathematical

FR920020086US1

expressions relating information of different items in the spreadsheet. For example, a user can change an item in the spreadsheet by changing references to the item in the mathematical expressions. The mathematical expressions reference information of different items according to indications of the respective items in the spreadsheet. This distinguishes the spreadsheet of Salas et al. from conventional spreadsheets which reference information of different items according to cell name, e.g. C5, A3, etc.

Thus, Salas et al. teach a method that allows a user to use labels that are indicative of the data represented by the labels. Salas et al. do not teach the use of labels that include mathematical expressions of other labels as the Examiner asserted. For example, if label "retail" is descriptive of retail numbers and label "invoice" is descriptive of invoice numbers and if the retail numbers are 1.25 times the invoice numbers, then the word "retail" is used as a label for the retail numbers and the word "invoice" is used as a label for the invoice numbers. However, the mathematical expression "invoice*1.25" is not used as the label of the retail numbers as in the claimed invention.

The Examiner further stated that Salas et al. in combination with Hatakeda et al. reads on the claimed invention (see bottom of page of the Answer Brief). Appellants respectfully disagree.

Firstly, there would not be any reason for anyone skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Salas et al. with those of Hatakeda et al. to arrive at the claimed invention.

As mentioned above, Salas et al. provide a calculation portion in the spreadsheet where a user can establish mathematical expressions relating information of different items in the spreadsheet. Thus, Salas et al. teach a method of identifying and manipulating a whole range of cells through a mathematical expression in the mathematical expression portion of the spreadsheet.

Hatakeda et al., on the other hand, disclose a method of identifying and manipulating the source or sources that an object is dependent upon. The
FR920020086US1

object, in this case, is a cell formula or a spreadsheet cell having a cell formula that contains a reference to a source, or references to sources, that the cell formula or spreadsheet cell is dependent upon. Alternatively, the object is a graph object that is associated with a spreadsheet and dependent upon a source or sources. In either case, however, the source is preferably a cell or a range of cells in a spreadsheet.

Thus, Hatakeda *et al.* disclose a method of identifying and manipulating cell formulae.

Based on the teachings of Salas *et al.* (i.e., a method of identifying and manipulating a whole range of cells through a mathematical expression), there is no reason for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Hatakeda *et al.* (a method of identifying and manipulating cell formulae) with those of Salas *et al.*

Secondly, it is a well settled law that there must be a teaching or suggestion in a reference for one to combine the teachings of the reference with those of another reference. (See *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783–84 (Fed. Cir. 1992) where the Court ruled that “[o]bviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination.”) (See also *ACS Hosp. Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984) where it is stated that the mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.)

In this case, there is not a teaching or suggestion in either Salas *et al.* or Hatakeda *et al.* for combining the teachings of the references.

Thirdly, even if there were a teaching or suggestion to combine the teachings of the references and that one skilled in the art would want to combine them, the teachings of the references would not be combined to show the claimed invention since, as stated above, Salas *et al.* do not teach the step of

using labels to label input and output fields wherein the label of the output field is expressed as a mathematical expression of the label of the input field.

Based on the foregoing, Appellants request reversal of the rejection and passage to issue of the claims in the Application.

Respectfully Submitted

By: 

Volel Esmile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969